

### **REMARKS**

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the above-referenced application. The Office Action, however, has maintained its previous rejections of all claims. In this regard, claims 1-3, 7, 9-10, and 13-14 remain rejected as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,923,307 to Hogle, IV (hereafter Hogle). Claims 4-5, 8, and 11-12 remain rejected as allegedly obvious over the combination of the '307 patent and U.S. Patent 5,748,189 to Trueblood (hereafter Trueblood). Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 9 to be consistent with points made in their prior response, and Applicants have canceled claim 13 without prejudice or disclaimer. For at least the reasons set forth herein, Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and that the rejections be withdrawn.

#### **Claim Amendments Raise No New Issues and Should be Entered**

Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 9 to specify a feature that was discussed in the remarks section of the previous response (a feature that was considered inherent in the claims). In response to the present Office Action's argument that the feature was not expressly recited in the claims, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 9 to include this feature. As the feature was previously discussed, its addition to claims 1 and 9 raises no new issues, and the amendments should be entered.

#### **Claims 1-12 and 14**

The rejections set forth in the Office Action (pages 3-6) are word for word the same as the rejections of the previous Office Action. However, on pages 2 and 3, the Office Action sets forth responses to some of Applicants' previous remarks. In this section (bottom of first paragraph on page 2), the Examiner commented that the feature of the window not being

repositioned is not found in any independent claim. Applicants understand this statement to imply that such a feature would patently define Applicants' claims over the cited references.

While not making this specific amendment, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 9 to capture the essence of this feature, by specifying that the context data is sent to only one of the displays, while a window is displayed across at least two displays, with a portion of the window being displayed in each of the displays. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite "while a window is displayed across the two displays, with a portion of the window being displayed in each of the two displays" and claim 9 is amended to recite "while a minority portion of the window is displayed in at least one other display." For reasons that were fully discussed in the previous response, these features clearly define over the Hogle reference. In this regard, FIG. 16(a)-16(c) of Hogle, which were heavily relied upon by the Office Action, specifically teach the repositioning of a window such that it does NOT span multiple displays. It is in this repositioning of the window into a single display that supports the Office Action's contention that context data is sent to only one of the displays (indeed, it would only need to be sent to the display containing the entire window). However, in systems where a window spans multiple displays, the feature of the context data being directed to the display hardware of only one display defines independent claims 1 and 9 over the cited art. For at least this reason the rejections of claims 1 and 9 should be withdrawn. As claims 2-8, 10-12, and 14 depend from claims 1 and 9, the rejections of these claims should be withdrawn as well.


Notwithstanding the foregoing, and the amendments to claims 1 and 9, Applicants repeat and reallege the remarks set forth in their previous response.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all pending claims are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this Amendment and Response to Office Action. If, however, any fee is deemed to be payable, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to Hewlett-Packard Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel R. McClure  
Registration No. 38,962  
(770) 933-9500

Please continue to send all future correspondence to:

Hewlett-Packard Development Company, L.P.  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400